

REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation. Please note that claims 1-6 have been canceled. Claims 7-18 are new.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the abstract because it allegedly did not comply with the proper format for U.S. practice. The abstract has been rewritten to comply with the proper format, see the amendment above.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 2 as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has canceled claim 2, thus this objection is moot.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lucast et al. (U.S. Patent 6,103,369) (hereinafter Lucast). This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in light of the new claims.

Applicant's new independent claim recites, "an adhesive layer comprising a plurality of grooves disposed on said base material, wherein said grooves extend in the tape width direction and are arranged in an array configuration in the longitudinal direction of said tape; said grooves not containing adhesive thereby facilitating breathability; and said grooves not extending across the entire width of said tape but having adhesive between said grooves".

The Examiner argues that "Lucast et al. teaches recess grooves in the adhesive layer (56) extending in the tape (50) width direction". However, Lucast teaches a dressing with a "polymeric backing layer **52**, high moisture vapor transmission backing layer **54**, high moisture vapor transmission adhesive

layer **58** and pattern coated adhesive **56**". See Col. 5, Lines 36-38. The pattern coated adhesive in Lucast, according to Fig. 4, comprises protrusions on top of the high moisture vapor transmission adhesive layer **58**. See Col. 5, Lines 38-40. Thus, Lucast comprises two layers of adhesive, one of which comprises protrusions on top of the other.

Unlike Lucast, Applicant's recited claims comprise an adhesive layer with a plurality of grooves not containing adhesive. The grooves without adhesive allow the skin to breathe. Thus, Applicant's claimed grooves serve as ventilation for the skin. Lucast fails to disclose or even contemplate an adhesive layer with grooves not containing adhesive. Rather, Lucast teaches a skin contacting adhesive layer with no grooves (see Figs. 1-3 and 5, element numbers **16**, **36**, **46**, and **70**) or, alternatively, a high moisture vapor transmission adhesive layer **58** with a pattern coated adhesive **56** on top (see Fig. 4). While Applicant's recited grooves contain no adhesive, Lucast's disclosed pattern coated adhesive teaches the opposite, namely, an adhesive pattern on top of another adhesive layer.

Lucast fails to anticipate each and every element of Applicant's recited claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucast in view of Kase (U.S. Patent 5,861,348). This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in light of the new claims.

The arguments regarding Lucast above apply equally to this § 103 rejection. Further, Kase fails to teach grooves that extend in the tape width direction and are arranged in an array configuration in the longitudinal direction of said tape as recited in Applicant's claim 7. Instead, Kase teaches "pressure-sensitive adhesive layers are formed so that they meander left and right along the length of the tape". See Kase Abstract. Kase further teaches, "a plurality of wavy strip-shaped pressure-sensitive adhesive layers". See Col. 6, lines 31-32. Thus, Kase teaches away from Applicant's claimed grooves that extend

in the tape width direction and are arranged in an array configuration in the longitudinal direction since the adhesive layer in Kase is wave shaped.


None of the cited references either alone or in combination teach or render obvious Applicant's recited claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.

Authorization is given to charge payment of any additional fees required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct. 13-4213.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Samantha A. Updegraff, Reg. No. 60,139
Direct line: (505) 998-6124

PEACOCK MYERS, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
P.O. Box 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927

Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

Customer No. 005179

G:\A-CLIENTS\Kinesio\PAT\10-588854\Response to OA due 062309.doc